



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY, WEST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
900 COMMODORE DRIVE
SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA 94066-5008

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5090

Ser 10121/8068

11 August 1998

From: Commanding Officer, Engineering Field Activity West, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

To: Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Members Distribution List, Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord

Subj: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB): MINUTES OF 16 JULY 1998 RAB MEETING

Encls: (1) Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord, Restoration Advisory Board Draft Meeting Minutes -- Thursday, 16 July 1998

1. Draft minutes of the 16 July 1998 Weapons Support Facility (WPNSUPPFAC) Seal Beach, Detachment Concord, Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting are forwarded as enclosure (1). Any corrections or clarifications to these minutes can be provided at the next RAB meeting, at which time the minutes will be finalized.

2. The next RAB meeting is scheduled for 7:00 p.m. on Thursday 17 September 1998 at the Clyde Community Center. Please note that there will be no August RAB meeting.

3. Election of the next Community Co-Chair will be held at the September meeting, and all current RAB community members are encouraged to attend.

4. If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact Mr Steve Gallo, the current RAB Community Co-Chair, at (925) 427-3450; or Mr. Stan Heller, the WPNSUPPFAC Detachment Concord Co-Chair, at (925) 246-5672.

WING WONG

By direction

Distribution:

Ms. Elizabeth Robinson Anello

Mr. Steven Bachofer

Mr. Scott Etzel

Mr. Steve Gallo

Mr. Edward Gardner

Ms. Susan Gladstone

Mr David Golick/Ms. Celeste Wixom

Mr. Stanley Heller

Ms. Dee Kilcoyne

Mr. David Kory

Ms. Sylvia Kotecki
Ms. Nicole Moutoux
Mr Marcus O'Connell
Mr. James Pinasco
Mr. Richard Purdue
Ms. Catie Roy
Mr. Roy Santana
Mr. Thomas Shirley
Mr. Larry Steinwandt
Mr. Gene Sylls

Copy to:
TtEMI (Attn: John Bosche)

Blind copy to (w/encl):
1012, 10121, 10122
Information repository: (3 copies)
Chron

**WEAPONS SUPPORT FACILITY SEAL BEACH, DETACHMENT CONCORD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD**

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

**Clyde Community Center
Clyde, California**

Thursday, 16 July 1998

I. Welcome and Introductions, Community Co-Chair's Report, and Approval of Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes, and Community Co-Chair Nominations

The Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on Thursday, 16 July at the Clyde Community Center, Clyde, California. Steve Gallo, Community Co-Chair, welcomed guests, and Stan Heller, Navy Co-Chair, introduced Ralph Lee, a contract employee hired to provide Mr. Heller with assistance with the RAB and Installation Restoration (IR) Program.

Mr. Heller noted a group of documents brought by Roy Santana, Engineering Field Activity (EFA) West. Mr. Lee will be adding them to the Pleasant Hill library information repository in the next week or so to bring the repository up-to-date.

Mr. Lee announced that he has been a community member of the Mare Island RAB for two years.

Mr. Gallo encouraged RAB members to talk with community members about cleanup issues and return their responses back to the Navy for consideration. Another important RAB responsibility, Mr. Gallo emphasized, is to recruit new RAB members. He added that nominations are currently being accepted for election of a new Community Co-Chair in September.

Edward Gardner requested attendance lists from the past year so that he can contact some of them and assess whether they are willing to participate in RAB meetings, review documents, and/or participate in the election. He noted that he is willing to call half the people on the list, if someone else would volunteer to call the other half. Mr. Heller later added that perhaps calling will help assess whether quarterly RAB meetings are appropriate. Mr. Heller recalled that when meeting locations changed, the Navy expanded the mailing list to include about 100 to 150 people; names were gleaned from old meeting attendance lists and from tour sign-in sheets. He recollected that effort resulted in no new interest.

Additionally, Mr. Heller noted, RAB members continue to receive minutes and are being kept informed. Mr. Santana related that approximately 12-13 community members receive meeting minutes.

Mr. Gardner stated that he would like to begin outreach efforts to beyond existing RAB members, and Mr. Lee agreed to assemble a list for Mr. Gardner. Mr. Gardner stated that he also believes it would be a good idea to contact the cable channel, TCI, and radio stations to air free public service announcements. He also suggested developing a short notice for the Community Affairs section of a bulletin issued every two months by the City of Concord and for the local papers in Bay Point and the City of Martinez.

Mr. Heller asked whether Gutierrez-Palmenberg, Inc. (GPI) was placing notices in the *Contra Costa Times* community calender to inform the community of RAB meeting times and places. Mr. Gardner stated he had not seen RAB announcements in the community calender. Sandra Lunceford committed to follow-up on this action item and report back to the co-chairs. Mr. Gardner suggested adding information to the notice to include the RAB's role and function.

Mr. Lee noticed that representatives from environmental groups were not participating on the RAB. Mr. Gallo mentioned that he had spoken with a representative from the Community Action Pollution Program and has received no response. Mr. Gallo committed to contact Citizen's for a Better Environment, and Mr. Gardner also agreed to contact the Clyde Gazette.

Mr. Lee suggested contacting neighborhoods adjacent to IR sites, such as Bay Point and the cities of Concord and Martinez. He said that the Contra Costa Water District might also be interested in sending a representative to the RAB. Mr. Gardner suggested sending a courtesy letter to the Chambers of Commerce for the cities of Martinez, Concord, and Bay Point to solicit interest and explain the purpose of the RAB.

Mr. Heller encouraged that outreach efforts begin by assessing the level of interest of existing RAB members. If members indicate they are no longer interested, it may be helpful to find out why. Mr. Santana provided the following list of active RAB members: Steve Bachofer, Scott Etzell, Steve Gallo, Edward Gardner, Dave Kory, Sylvia Kotecki, Marcus O'Connell, Rich Purdue, and Tom Shirley. Mr. Heller asked how many RAB members constitute a quorum. Mr. Gardner recalled that voting has proceeded by majority in attendance. Mr. Heller asked if the new RAB co-chair will continue to have time to review documents, or whether that aspect of the program has been helpful. Mr. Gardner responded that it is possible to request technical assistance for the RAB through the Technical Assistance for Public Participation program. Mr. Gallo added that a technical review group has proved helpful.

Mr. Gallo suggested placing agendas at Lindsay Museum and other community bulletin boards. He noted that the agenda for tonight's meeting was posted on the bulletin board outside the Clyde Community Center.

Mr. Santana stated that the public may not be interested in the facility because it is not significantly contaminated and lacks major controversial environmental issues. He also noted that some RABs at other open bases meet every six months.

Mr. Gallo concluded discussion on outreach with the following action items:

1. Mr. Heller and Mr. Lee will develop a list of contacts for Mr. Gardner's and Mr. Gallo's outreach efforts.
2. Mr. Gallo will contact TCI to place a public service announcement.
3. Ms. Lunceford will provide information to the co-chairs about public notices in the Contra Costa Times.

The 18 June 1998 RAB meeting minutes were approved as written.

II. Napalm Area Cleanup at Site 13

John Bosche, Tetra Tech Environmental Management, Inc. (TtEMI), informed guests that Site 13, referred to as the Burn Area, was once used to practice fire fighting, burn various munitions waste, and for disposal. One area did exist within Site 13 that was found to contain elevated concentrations of hydrocarbons. Investigation found it to be an area where napalm was burned and the soil contained napalm residues. He added that benzene was also found in the area.

Historically, trenches were excavated by the Navy for railroad munitions storage. They were later used by the Navy for practice burns and disposal. Burn residues and disposal areas are isolated to trench areas. He noted that the napalm residue has been excavated, along with hydrocarbon impacted soils residing in the area. Excavated material was stockpiled on-site in containers and confirmation samples were collected and analyzed for total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs), and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Final sampling results indicate that there remains no significant risk to human health. Mr. Bosche added that the removal did *not* come under the auspices of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), because it involved hydrocarbon contamination, and hydrocarbons are exempt from CERCLA. Site 13 in its entirety will now be included in a Draft No Further Action Proposed Plan and Draft No Further Action Record of Decision for Sites 13, 17, 22, and 27, which is expected to be submitted next month.

Mr. Bosche noted that Table 2 of the napalm cleanup report contains before and after sampling results. He explained that upon project completion, no soil samples exceeded 100 parts per million (ppm) of TPH.

Mr. Lee asked whether the Navy considered burning the contaminated soil. Mr. Bosche replied that the project involved removing 3 cubic yards of napalm residue and 20 cubic yards of soil which is conducive to economical off-site disposal.

Mr. Gallo asked whether the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) agreed with the cleanup levels, and Mr. Bosche responded that RWQCB usually agrees with cleaning up to 100 mg/kg of TPH. Mr. Lee added that Mr. Bosche is familiar with the Livermore Study on Natural

Attenuation that affirms that 1000 ppm of TPH in the soil is an acceptable level, and that cleaning up soil below that level is not cost-effective, as long as there are no other issues.

Mr. Gardner asked if the remaining contamination could affect the Contra Costa Canal. Mr. Bosche related that 100 ppm TPH in soil has no potential for moving into groundwater. He explained that if there was an actual plume, the plume would migrate to a certain point where contamination is found to degrade at the same rate as plume movement. This equilibrium or steady state is found to exist at plume boundaries because hydrocarbons degrade naturally in the environment, and their movement is very slow. Mr. Bosche explained that maximum concentrations of 100 ppm of hydrocarbons pose no threat to a well ten feet away.

Mr. Heller added that the excavated soil met nonhazardous criteria. Mr. Bosche noted that when soil is stockpiled, sampling results are frequently lower than the highest concentration samples taken from the original area because soil is combined with other lower concentration soil and an averaging effect occurs. Mr. Bosche reported that the stockpile concentrations were between 30 and 50 ppm.

Mr. Gallo paraphrased the *Installation Summary from the Department of the Navy Environmental Restoration Plan for Fiscal Years 1998-2002* and stated that out of a total of 53 IR sites on Concord, 36 are clean; two are being cleaned up; and 15 are underway. Mr. Gallo concluded that approximately half the remedial work at Concord is complete. Mr. Heller cautioned that counting the numbers of sites cleaned up may provide faulty reassurance, as it is possible that one remaining site may require extensive cleanup. Mr. Santana added that there were 53 sites back in 1980, and that number includes sites that have been investigated and dropped from the program because nothing was found. Mr. Santana calculated that nine sites remain under investigation, and noted that 2005 is the expected date of completion. He reported that the investigations and cleanups may actually be completed before then.

(The agenda was amended at this time to reflect similarities between Site 13 and Site 17.)

III. Confirmatory Groundwater Sampling at Site 17

Mr. Bosche noted that Site 17 is in the same Inland Area Remedial Investigation as Site 13 and requested to address this item before the Draft Site Investigation Work Plan. Sampling efforts during the Remedial Investigation, he continued, detected *bis*-2 (ethylhexyl) phthalate in two wells on Site 17 at 55 and 60 micrograms/liter (ug/L). He related that this chemical is recognized as a common laboratory contaminant, and oftentimes isn't even considered a contaminant when detected at certain levels. But since the chemical was found in two wells at relatively higher levels than were allowable, the Navy obtained two more quarters of groundwater samples from two wells to evaluate the groundwater conditions at Site 17. After follow-up sampling results were validated and confirmed to be accurate, semivolatiles were determined to be nondetect in both wells during both of the quarterly groundwater monitoring events. Mr. Bosche concluded that *bis*-2(ethylhexyl)phthalate may have originated from another source, such as the laboratory, or well construction material, but is not in the

groundwater at Site 17. This confirmatory analysis, he added, allows Site 17 to proceed into the No Further Action Proposed Plan and Record of Decision.

Mr. Lee asked if the chemical was used to clean laboratory equipment. Mr. Bosche responded that he didn't know, but did notice positive results in the past in laboratory blanks and field blanks that were used to verify that laboratory and field equipment are clean. If it is seen in low enough concentrations, it is not even reported as a contaminant.

Mr. Gallo asked what method the Navy used to detect the contaminant, and Mr. Bosche responded that he didn't know, but confirmed that all analysis follow Contract Laboratory Program protocol recommended by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.EPA). Mr. Bosche added that the laboratory detection limit for this constituent is 4.0 ppb in water. Additionally, he noted that all laboratories that TtEMI uses are certified by the Navy and the State of California to meet strict quality assurance/quality control criteria. TtEMI also validates all data in accordance with strict data validation requirements.

Mr. Santana noted that this information will be added as an addendum to the main Remedial Investigation document.

IV. Draft Site Investigation Work Plan, Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs) 2, 5, 7, 18, and Site 29

Mr. Bosche noted the Navy has received comments from U.S.EPA, and does not expect to receive comments from the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) or RWQCB on the Draft Site Investigation Work Plan for SWMUs 2, 5, 7, 18, and Site 29. He informed guests that the comment period is now closed. Mr. Santana related that DTSC and RWQCB informed him that they will not be submitting comments. Mr. Bosche observed similarities between RAB and U.S.EPA comments, and expects that all comments can be addressed without substantive changes in the Work Plan.

Mr. Bosche related that a few wells at SWMU sites 2, 5, 7, and 18 had less than 10 ug/L of tetrachloroethene (PCE), trichloroethene (TCE), dichloroethene (DCE), and dichloroethane (DCA). Less than 4 ug/L of 2-methyl naphthalene and naphthalene were also noted. The Navy is unable to determine the source of these constituents and proposes to install wells to establish whether potential sources exist. If contamination is found, additional wells will be constructed if necessary to evaluate the source. Wells will also be installed downgradient of areas noted to be contaminated, and additional wells will be installed in building and work areas that could represent potential sources.

Mr. Bosche referred to the decision tree within the Work Plan that indicates if higher concentrations are *not* found, results will reflect that the area was used for general industrial purposes and do not indicate a discrete larger quantity spill. Mr. Bosche explained that in this

case, sites will be recommended for no further action. If sampling results indicate contamination is present in higher concentrations, further investigation may be warranted. Mr. Bosche indicated that the investigation of the area to date has generally found very low chemical concentrations which pose no threat to human health.

Additionally, he noted, the industrial area under investigation supports little ecological habitat and is essentially free of ecological receptors; risk to human health remains the only potential concern.

Site 29, Mr. Bosche explained, is another former SWMU site. Detections of SVOCs were found beneath a building in a crawl space. The Navy is proposing to determine whether contamination extends beyond the building's boundaries by drilling three soil borings. The crawl space beneath the building, he explained, slopes towards the center. He noted it appears that the area was excavated and the building constructed on top of the crawl space. Since the area required no leveling for concrete, the edges slope towards the middle. Mr. Bosche believes a stormdrain outfall in the area was used to drain out the low crawl space area.

Results obtained from soil borings 2901 and 2902 will show whether the contamination is confined beneath the building or whether it extends beyond the building's perimeter. Soil boring 2903 was installed to comply with the RWQCB's request to determine whether the sanitary sewer line may have leaked and potentially impacted surrounding soil. Mr. Bosche noted that it is highly unlikely this soil boring will find contamination, as testing of the leach field found nothing. Leach fields, he explained, are designed to leak chemicals, and nothing was found. In comparison, the sanitary sewer is designed to be tight.

Mr. Bosche then responded to RAB and U.S.EPA comments and requests.

Mr. Gallo requested Mr. Bosche to address the differences in CERCLA and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) requirements with regards to petroleum. Mr. Bosche related that historically SWMU sites 2, 5, 7, and 18 operated under RCRA regulations. Since a discrete source of RCRA contamination was unable to be identified, the Navy is currently following CERCLA cleanup protocol, which Mr. Bosche noted is very similar to RCRA.

Mr. Bosche related that CERCLA has a petroleum exclusion clause that exempts petroleum contaminated sites from being regulated by CERCLA. Mr. Santana added that SWMU sites were included in the CERCLA program because they contain additional constituents that are not derived from oil. RCRA is the regulation used to govern petroleum cleanup. The investigation of SWMU sites 2, 5, 7, and 18, Mr. Heller added, will continue with analysis for petroleum.

Mr. Bosche explained that the Navy conducts sampling to confirm the presence or absence of suspected chemicals regardless of what program or regulation they fall into. The goal is to characterize each site and gather enough information for regulatory agencies to either approve it for no further action or recommend it for continued remediation. Mr. Bosche related that he is not completely familiar with legal technicalities, and that the Navy sometimes can decide the

regulatory framework under which to pursue site investigation.

Mr. Bosche referred to RAB general comment #1 regarding the decision tree in Figure 3-1. The comment requests an explanation about why risk assessment is not warranted when confirmation sampling results are consistent with existing data. He noted that results of testing have indicated very low concentrations of contamination, and if higher concentrations of contamination are not found, a source cannot be identified. He added that concentrations lower than preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) for soil or drinking water standards for groundwater do not pose a risk and a risk assessment is not indicated.

Mr. Santana explained that Figure 3-1 refers to maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) for drinking water, and noted that Susan Gladstone, RWQCB, related that the levels were extremely close to the allowable levels. The Navy, he continued, is going to confirm that this is still the case. Once the low levels are confirmed, Mr. Bosche added, the site will be appropriate for no further action. Should results indicate higher concentrations, then the area will be further investigated. Mr. Gallo agreed that was a valid explanation, but believed it should be appropriately documented within the Work Plan. Mr. Bosche acknowledged that it is appropriate to add verbiage to clarify the issue.

Mr. Bosche responded to RAB general comments #2-3 that question the use of "Y" in Figures 2-2 and 2-8, ask for metal concentrations, note the figures lack legends, and request units of measure. Mr. Bosche acknowledged that the figures lack a legend, and the information will be added to the final report. He reported that chemical concentrations are reported in ug/L for groundwater samples, and "Y" indicates that the Navy did analyze for metals. When metal concentrations are listed, he noted that they exceed PRGs and background concentrations. These results indicate anomalies that trigger attention. The rest of the metals results reflect background concentrations or are lower than PRGs.

In responding to RAB general comment #4, that asked whether elevated TPH levels at SWMU sites similar to SWMU 18 can be handled through another program, Mr. Bosche indicated that the RCRA Facility Assessment concluded that in many cases soil samples taken from locations above and below the contaminated soil were significantly lower concentrations or were nondetect. In these anomalous situations, the source of contamination is unknown, and the contamination is believed to lie in a very discrete area. In these cases, the RCRA Facility Assessment Confirmation Study concluded that the existing TPH contamination does not have any impact on surrounding soil groundwater, and there is not enough contamination to warrant cleanup. Mr. Bosche shared that regulatory agencies submitted few comments on these conclusions. Mr. Bosche affirmed that the Navy does have knowledge of underground storage tanks (UST) at the Weapons Support Facility that have leaked and are being addressed in the UST Program; the RCRA anomalies are not being investigated further.

Mr. Heller explained that an area near Building IA-16 contains four USTs known to have impacted groundwater. The tanks IA-17 A-D are scheduled to be removed at the end of July or beginning of August. Mr. Bosche responded that concentrations of TPH in that area reach 130

milligrams/liter which equates to 0.013% TPH (correction to the 13% erroneously stated at the meeting). He noted that every single soil sample taken from a depth of 6 ft. - 26 ft. is very significantly impacted in at least one boring. Other hydrocarbons in the area contribute significantly to the impact.

Mr. Heller asked whether sampling at the bottom of the excavated USTs is planned to which Mr. Bosche replied that it depends on how deep excavation proceeds. Mr. Heller queried whether soil excavated from UST removal will be sampled for SVOCs, because excavation may result in removing other contaminants. Mr. Bosche responded that it may be worthwhile to gather a deep sample when excavation approaches a clean boundary, but that it is imprudent to sample in the middle of hot spots. Mr. Bosche related that buildings are not likely sources of TPH contamination, whereas PCE and TCE are more likely to appear around buildings. Mr. Heller noted that he wants to be sure to solve all pieces of the puzzle.

Mr. Bosche responded to RAB specific question #1 regarding whether or not industrial wells in Mallard Reservoir are used to produce water. He noted that the wells are *not* used for drinking water, but that the Contra Costa Water District is interested in maintaining the highest water quality possible for emergency use. Mr. Bosche added that they are occasionally used for industrial water. The comment also pointed out that reference is made to wells in Figure 2-4 that are actually found in Figure 2-8.

RAB specific comment #2 questioned why groundwater will not be sampled at Site 29 to which Mr. Bosche shared that water has not been encountered in 15 foot soil borings, and SVOCs in the area tend to be immobile. If soil analysis suggests that the constituents have spread, then investigation will proceed to deeper levels and wells may be drilled. Mr. Heller and Mr. Bosche recalled that Nicole Moutoux, U.S.EPA, had expressed the same comment and requested that the Navy document their logic.

Mr. Bosche responded to RAB specific comment #3 requesting the Navy to explain why ecological risk is not a concern for these sites, though the Navy is analyzing for risk to human health. SWMU's 2, 5, 7, and 18, he said, are fully paved sites and devoid of habitat for ecological receptor, whereas, Site 29 has a few grassy areas. The habitat at Site 29 consists of disturbed grassland and heavily graded areas resulting in low grade habitat.

RAB specific comment #4 noted varying descriptions of the direction of groundwater flow; Mr. Bosche explained that groundwater flow will be confirmed as the investigation proceeds. The direction of flow is affected by various geological factors, and it has been known to flow southwest as well as to the northwest, much like a river that flows in several directions on its way downstream.

RAB specific comment #5 refers to discrepancies between text descriptions and monitoring well numbers and locations in Figure 2-6 to which Mr. Bosche responded that the map and text will be amended for consistency.

V. Draft Final Feasibility Study (FS), Tidal Area Landfill Site 1

Mr. Bosche discussed two major comments shared by U.S.EPA and RWQCB that didn't get fully addressed in the draft final. He noted that the remainder of the comments were incorporated into the document, and responses to comments are found in Appendix G. He announced that the draft final report will become final on 30 July, and he does not expect any additional comments from U.S.EPA.

One of the two items pertains to creating additional wetlands as a part of this project. Mr. Bosche explained that the revised Draft Final FS contains the Navy's plan to maintain the current footprint of the existing landfill; therefore wetland destruction is not anticipated and mitigative, new wetland creation is not required. Mr. Bosche explained that regulatory agencies are concerned when construction extends beyond the boundaries of the existing landfill. The Navy has established a perimeter that incorporates the existing boundaries and will not be crossing that margin. Mr. Bosche stated that if a construction accident occurs that negatively impacts a wetland, the issue will be revisited.

The other main comment requested an ecological evaluation of existing habitat on the surface of the landfill. Mr. Bosche related that the only practical way to close the landfill is to construct a cap. Currently the landfill material is exposed and must be covered. The Navy has received no additional comments.

Mr. Lee noted that the FS relates that groundwater is not mounding beneath the landfill, and that the groundwater elevation is high and movement is very slow. Mr. Lee stated that this defines a mounding effect. Mr. Heller noted that new information may have been found by Rik Lantz, TtEMI.

Mr. Bosche confirmed that the purpose of the FS is to decide the appropriate remedial activity that should be conducted at Site 1. Construction of a native soil cap on the landfill continues to be the plan. Mr. Bosche said this is considered to be an appropriate plan because it: 1) reduces surface water infiltration into the landfill, 2) protects people from physically falling into the debris, and 3) prevents exposure to wildlife.

The Navy, Mr. Bosche related, will be proceeding to the Proposed Plan/ROD stage for Site 1 and will design and construct the cap.

Mr. Heller asked how long the cap maintenance will be paid by CERCLA. Mr. Santana responded that the previous Environmental Restoration Manual stipulated ten years, however the revised manual does not specify an exact number of years. Mr. Heller asked how long the design for the contract is guaranteed. Mr. Santana responded that he has budgeted CERCLA funds for ten years of maintenance, after which the activity bears the cost.

VI. Date and Agenda for Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held at the Clyde Community Center on 17 September 1998. There will be no meeting in August.

Possible future agenda items include:

- Elections
- No Further Action Proposed Plan and Record of Decision for the Inland Area - presentation and/or discussion
- Review upcoming projects; status of current projects

A copy of these meeting minutes will be made available for public review at the Information Repository located at the Main Branch of the Contra Costa County Library in Pleasant Hill, CA.

ATTACHMENT A

**Attendance List
NWS Concord
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
Thursday, July 16, 1998**

**Naval Weapons Station, Concord
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Attendance**

Date: 7-16-98

RAB MEMBER	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Phone Number</i>
Steven Bachofer		
Scott Etzel		
Steve Gallo	<i>Steve Gallo</i>	925-370-7969
Edward Gardner	<i>Edward Gardner</i>	686-71837
Dee Kilcoyne		
Sylvia Kotecki		
Richard Purdue		
Thomas Shirley		
Larry Steinwandt		
Gene Sylls		
Steve Volk		
NAVY REPRESENTATIVES		
Clint Fisher (EFA West)		
Mary Gleason (Tetra Tech EM Inc.)		
Stan Heller (NWS Concord)	<i>Stan Heller</i>	925-246-5672
Roy Santana (EFA West)	<i>Roy Santana</i>	(650) 244-2523
<i>Ralph Lee (NWS Concord)</i>	<i>Ralph M. Lee</i>	925-246-5710
REGULATORY AGENCIES		
Susan Gladstone (RWQCB)		
Nicole Moutoux (U.S. EPA)		
James Pinasco (DTSC)		
Lynn Suer (U.S. EPA)		

Date: 1-16-98

[illegible]

ATTACHMENT B

**Agenda
NWS Concord
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
Thursday, July 16, 1998**

**DRAFT AGENDA
WEAPONS SUPPORT FACILITY SEAL BEACH, DETACHMENT CONCORD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

Thursday, July 16, 1998

**7:00 - 9:00 p.m.
Clyde Community Center
109 Wellington Road
Clyde, California**

-
- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 7:00 - 7:20 | Welcome and Introductions, Community Co-chair's Report, Approval of Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes, and Community Co-Chair Nominations - Steve Gallo, RAB Community Co-chair |
| 7:20 - 7:30 | Napalm Area Cleanup at Site 13 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summary of Cleanup, Results, and Conclusions - John Bosche, Tetra Tech EM Inc. |
| 7:30 - 7:50 | Draft Site Investigation Work Plan, SWMUs 2,5,7,18, and Site 29 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• RAB Comments and Discussion - Steve Gallo/John Bosche |
| 7:50 - 8:00 | Confirmatory Groundwater Sampling at Site 17 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Results and Conclusions - John Bosche |
| 8:00 - 8:10 | Break |
| 8:10 - 8:50 | Draft Final Feasibility Study (FS), Tidal Area Landfill Site 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussion on CAP selected in FS - John Bosche• Discussion of Navy Responses to Agency Comments - John Bosche/ Nicole Moutoux |
| 8:50 - 8:55 | Date and Agenda for Next Meeting - Steve Gallo |
| 8:55 - 9:00 | Public comment |
| 9:00 | Adjournment |

ATTACHMENT C

**Presentation Materials
NWS Concord
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
Thursday, June 18, 1997**

- RAB Member Comments on Draft Site Investigation Work Plan
SWMU 2,5,7,18 and Site 29

Read Message

[Help](#)[Reply](#) [Reply All](#) [Forward](#) [as attachment](#) ▼[Back to Sent](#)[Delete](#) [Message - Download](#)[- Choose Folder -](#) ▼ [Move](#)**Date:** Thu, 16 Jul 1998 07:17:04 -0700 (PDT)**From:** Steve Gallo <sgallo_9@yahoo.com> [Add to Address Book](#)**Subject:** draft work plan swmu2,5,7,18 and site 29**To:** BOSCHEJ@TTEMI.COM, resantana@efawest.navfac.navy.mil

John and Roy

For your use

RAB comments on the following:

Draft Site Investigation Work Plan
SWMU 2, 5, 7, 18, and site 29
Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord
Rev 5/8/98

General comments:

1. Figure 3-1. The flow diagrams indicate the decision has been made that should confirmation sampling be in the range of existing sampling, the area's contamination is not a concern (by going to SEA). Provide an explanation of why a risk assessment would not be warranted in this situation.

2. Several tables of sampling results indicate metals found as "Y". See figures 2-2 and 2-8 for example. What are the metals values for the locations? Why are only a few metals values provided?

3. Figures need to have legend with the units for the table values. Provide information such as feet and ug/l.

4. Will cleanup of the elevated TPH indications in the areas, such as SWMU 18, be handled through another program?

Specific comments:

1. Page 2-12, Section 2.5.2 Hydrology. In the 2nd paragraph reference is made to figure 2-4 concerning industrial wells, but the wells are shown on figure 2-8? The presenter for the Litigation Site ground water noted the industrial wells were not in use but this author identifies these wells as in use?

2. Page 3-1, Section 3.0 SI Work Plan Objectives. In the 1st paragraph the author identifies only soil to be checked at site 29, Why only soil checked and not groundwater?

3. Paragraph 3.1.2 Step 2 - Identify the Decision. The text describes that contaminate levels will be considered for their potential as a human health concern. Please describe in the document why ecological risks are not a concern for these sites.

4. Figure 2-8 shows the ground water flow direction to be to the N/NW

but the text at page 2-12 says the ground water direction is to the W/SW. Why the difference?

5. Page 3-10, Section 3.2.1 There are differences between the text descriptions of new monitoring well numbers and locations and the locations shown on Figure 2-6. For example MW-12 is described as SE of building IA-51 but figure shows it as NE of IA-51 and MW -13 and 14 seem switched.

thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Steve Gallo
RAB community Co-chair

DO YOU YAHOO!?

Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com>

Delete

Message - Download

- Choose Folder -

Move

Reply

Reply All

Forward

as attachment

[Back to Sent](#)

Copyright © 1997-98 Yahoo! Inc. All rights reserved.